

VOLUME XV. RESTAURANTS. CALLIOPE RESTAURANT. U. E. BAILEY, Proprietor.

THE ABOVE ESTABLISHMENT is now open, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink. The public are invited to call and see it. No 32 Third street, bet. Market and Jefferson.

CHARLES EDEN, No 32 Third street, bet. Market and Jefferson. IS AGENT FOR J. PARRO'S CELEBRATED PAPER, which he will sell at the lowest market price.

CHARLES EXCHANGE, No 32 Third street, bet. Market and Jefferson. I AM PREPARED TO SUPPLY THE public with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

SLOAN'S LADIES' RESTAURANT, THE NECESSITY FOR A LADIES' RESTAURANT. It is now open, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

MARBLE HALL, Restaurant and Coffee-House, FIFTH STREET, OFF. COURT PLACE. WE WOULD INFORM OUR friends that we have moved to the new building, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

WALKER'S EXCHANGE RESTAURANT, IS NOW IN FULL BLAZE! OUR RESTAURANT IS NOW FULLY OPENED, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

ST. CHARLES EXCHANGE, RESTAURANT, BILLIARD, AND REFRESHMENT SALOON. FIFTH STREET, BETWEEN MAIN AND MARKET. I AM DAILY RECEIVING FINE WINE, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

Baltimore Oyster IMPORTING HOUSE! I AM RECEIVING DAILY BY EXPRESS, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

Ladies' Oyster Saloon and RESTAURANT. THUNDERBOLT BEGS to inform his friends that he has moved to the new building, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETO, has been dissolved, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETO, has been dissolved, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETO, has been dissolved, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETO, has been dissolved, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is very indebted to Judge Campbell, because he has constructed the law adverse to Walker and his emigrants. The editor thinks the Judge should regard the opinions and wishes of his friends who put him in office, and his own antecedents. This is a new rule of judicial construction. We have been convinced, upon reading the law, that it was exceedingly stringent in its provisions; too much so entirely; but a Judge must take it as he finds it. We object to his construing it according to party notions, or according to his discretion as to what it ought to be.

Our neutrality laws need revision. We do not believe they are either right or expedient; but it is the business of Congress to change them, not the business of a Judge to construe them away.

A bill has passed the House of Representatives of Georgia, prohibiting the marriage of first cousins. It was passed by a vote of fifty-six to fifty-two.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is pursuing the course we expected of him. In this instance, it is his best policy. We commend him for this. Let him persevere to the best of his abilities. He has nothing to lose in the North, and something to gain, perhaps, in the South. He is for having slavery protected in the territories; for Congress is; and that, too, by Congress. He feels almost a contempt for the policy that would decline insisting on what he professes to hold to be the rights of the South, on the ground that it is impracticable to accomplish the object. It is not smart in him, but new to become valiant for the South, and we therefore commend his course; it is the best he can do. Hurray for him! It is not often that he shows any political tact; but this time he is almost right.

We assure him that it is a principle with us, not to insist on what is impracticable between the two sections of this Union. If a measure were vital to the North, we should be compelled to go for it; no matter what the consequences might be; but if it is of slight importance, and can only arouse agitation and angry controversy, and, perhaps, a separation of the States, we are against it. Whatever the right may be, the success of what he advocates is impossible; and if the South insist upon it, she shows only a determination to set up for herself, and make an end of this Union.

The Editor of the Journal affords to believe that General Cass was not understood, and that Mr. Buchanan was not understood. On the contrary, we believe they were both understood. It was not their fault if they were misunderstood. Their language was as unequivocal as language could be. It is getting to be a fashion these days to misunderstand plain language when it doesn't suit the purpose. The Editor is entirely mistaken in supposing that we put any other construction upon either the position of Cass or Buchanan, than the plain language does. We never made an issue with any one on this subject. We believe the opinion of Chief Justice Taney is right; but we are opposed to Congress interfering with slavery in the territories, in any event. If the responsibility of that body is acknowledged on this point, its action will be adverse to the South; therefore we say, hands off. We have the protection of the courts, and that is sufficient for any practical interest. We greatly prefer trusting the people of the territories, under the control of the judiciary, than Congress. A majority of the North will agree to that; and we are content with it. If the South will not, she can prepare for a separate confederacy. Indeed, we seriously apprehend that this is the object of the chief advocates of this movement. It is thought the best mode to make an issue, not to party North or South, but to make an issue, and make the refusal a ground of complaint that the North will not do its duty.

The Editor wishes to know if Congress is not bound to protect slavery in the territories. We hold that it is difficult to make out any such obligation on the part of Congress. The argument is far-fetched. There is no express grant of power to legislate for territories, either as persons or property; and it is more in accordance with the genius of our government to surmount all such legislation to the people concerned. We are for decentralizing always, when it is possible under the federal constitution. When the enterprising ladies pioneers begin to fill up our territories, they are not to be controlled by the powers at Washington. They will do as they please, and they will generally prefer to do better than Congress. If let alone, they are likely to adopt a more practical and more judicious legislation toward each other. This community independence is the safest policy in this country; because our people are accustomed to self-government, and are not likely to brook much control by a power remote from them, and in which they have no vote; and in which they are the mere foot ball of parties in the South.

The President himself found it so difficult to get along with one territory, that he earnestly recommended that it be thrown off, by making it a State; although there were not more than one-third enough population to make a State. He found it impossible to exercise any control, satisfactorily, and resolved to get rid of the difficulty. A better illustration of the impossibility of legislating for a territory at Washington could not well be given. The habits and character of our people will deter a wise statesman from pushing any theory into the equivocal and unpractical power of Congress. An old gentleman would not consent that Jack Jones should have his daughter, "Never-Jack Jones,"—couldn't think of it. He found it difficult to get along with his opposition; and the fair one suggested that Jack Jones was not the name; it was Col. Jones. The old gentleman consented at once.

It is very shocking that thirty thousand people in a territory should be trusted at all on the subject of slavery; but just change the name, and these same people can dispose of the whole subject.

The Editor of the Journal will not find anything in our files inconsistent with our position now. We have always regarded this outcry of squatter sovereignty as only a desire of needy partisans to create an agitation, for an end of no possible value. The slavery question is settled fairly. This remaining point is not worth an issue, much less such an agitation as it must necessarily produce.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is very indebted to Judge Campbell, because he has constructed the law adverse to Walker and his emigrants. The editor thinks the Judge should regard the opinions and wishes of his friends who put him in office, and his own antecedents. This is a new rule of judicial construction. We have been convinced, upon reading the law, that it was exceedingly stringent in its provisions; too much so entirely; but a Judge must take it as he finds it. We object to his construing it according to party notions, or according to his discretion as to what it ought to be.

Our neutrality laws need revision. We do not believe they are either right or expedient; but it is the business of Congress to change them, not the business of a Judge to construe them away.

A bill has passed the House of Representatives of Georgia, prohibiting the marriage of first cousins. It was passed by a vote of fifty-six to fifty-two.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is pursuing the course we expected of him. In this instance, it is his best policy. We commend him for this. Let him persevere to the best of his abilities. He has nothing to lose in the North, and something to gain, perhaps, in the South. He is for having slavery protected in the territories; for Congress is; and that, too, by Congress. He feels almost a contempt for the policy that would decline insisting on what he professes to hold to be the rights of the South, on the ground that it is impracticable to accomplish the object. It is not smart in him, but new to become valiant for the South, and we therefore commend his course; it is the best he can do. Hurray for him! It is not often that he shows any political tact; but this time he is almost right.

We assure him that it is a principle with us, not to insist on what is impracticable between the two sections of this Union. If a measure were vital to the North, we should be compelled to go for it; no matter what the consequences might be; but if it is of slight importance, and can only arouse agitation and angry controversy, and, perhaps, a separation of the States, we are against it. Whatever the right may be, the success of what he advocates is impossible; and if the South insist upon it, she shows only a determination to set up for herself, and make an end of this Union.

The Editor of the Journal affords to believe that General Cass was not understood, and that Mr. Buchanan was not understood. On the contrary, we believe they were both understood. It was not their fault if they were misunderstood. Their language was as unequivocal as language could be. It is getting to be a fashion these days to misunderstand plain language when it doesn't suit the purpose. The Editor is entirely mistaken in supposing that we put any other construction upon either the position of Cass or Buchanan, than the plain language does. We never made an issue with any one on this subject. We believe the opinion of Chief Justice Taney is right; but we are opposed to Congress interfering with slavery in the territories, in any event. If the responsibility of that body is acknowledged on this point, its action will be adverse to the South; therefore we say, hands off. We have the protection of the courts, and that is sufficient for any practical interest. We greatly prefer trusting the people of the territories, under the control of the judiciary, than Congress. A majority of the North will agree to that; and we are content with it. If the South will not, she can prepare for a separate confederacy. Indeed, we seriously apprehend that this is the object of the chief advocates of this movement. It is thought the best mode to make an issue, not to party North or South, but to make an issue, and make the refusal a ground of complaint that the North will not do its duty.

The Editor wishes to know if Congress is not bound to protect slavery in the territories. We hold that it is difficult to make out any such obligation on the part of Congress. The argument is far-fetched. There is no express grant of power to legislate for territories, either as persons or property; and it is more in accordance with the genius of our government to surmount all such legislation to the people concerned. We are for decentralizing always, when it is possible under the federal constitution. When the enterprising ladies pioneers begin to fill up our territories, they are not to be controlled by the powers at Washington. They will do as they please, and they will generally prefer to do better than Congress. If let alone, they are likely to adopt a more practical and more judicious legislation toward each other. This community independence is the safest policy in this country; because our people are accustomed to self-government, and are not likely to brook much control by a power remote from them, and in which they have no vote; and in which they are the mere foot ball of parties in the South.

The President himself found it so difficult to get along with one territory, that he earnestly recommended that it be thrown off, by making it a State; although there were not more than one-third enough population to make a State. He found it impossible to exercise any control, satisfactorily, and resolved to get rid of the difficulty. A better illustration of the impossibility of legislating for a territory at Washington could not well be given. The habits and character of our people will deter a wise statesman from pushing any theory into the equivocal and unpractical power of Congress. An old gentleman would not consent that Jack Jones should have his daughter, "Never-Jack Jones,"—couldn't think of it. He found it difficult to get along with his opposition; and the fair one suggested that Jack Jones was not the name; it was Col. Jones. The old gentleman consented at once.

It is very shocking that thirty thousand people in a territory should be trusted at all on the subject of slavery; but just change the name, and these same people can dispose of the whole subject.

The Editor of the Journal will not find anything in our files inconsistent with our position now. We have always regarded this outcry of squatter sovereignty as only a desire of needy partisans to create an agitation, for an end of no possible value. The slavery question is settled fairly. This remaining point is not worth an issue, much less such an agitation as it must necessarily produce.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is very indebted to Judge Campbell, because he has constructed the law adverse to Walker and his emigrants. The editor thinks the Judge should regard the opinions and wishes of his friends who put him in office, and his own antecedents. This is a new rule of judicial construction. We have been convinced, upon reading the law, that it was exceedingly stringent in its provisions; too much so entirely; but a Judge must take it as he finds it. We object to his construing it according to party notions, or according to his discretion as to what it ought to be.

Our neutrality laws need revision. We do not believe they are either right or expedient; but it is the business of Congress to change them, not the business of a Judge to construe them away.

A bill has passed the House of Representatives of Georgia, prohibiting the marriage of first cousins. It was passed by a vote of fifty-six to fifty-two.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is pursuing the course we expected of him. In this instance, it is his best policy. We commend him for this. Let him persevere to the best of his abilities. He has nothing to lose in the North, and something to gain, perhaps, in the South. He is for having slavery protected in the territories; for Congress is; and that, too, by Congress. He feels almost a contempt for the policy that would decline insisting on what he professes to hold to be the rights of the South, on the ground that it is impracticable to accomplish the object. It is not smart in him, but new to become valiant for the South, and we therefore commend his course; it is the best he can do. Hurray for him! It is not often that he shows any political tact; but this time he is almost right.

We assure him that it is a principle with us, not to insist on what is impracticable between the two sections of this Union. If a measure were vital to the North, we should be compelled to go for it; no matter what the consequences might be; but if it is of slight importance, and can only arouse agitation and angry controversy, and, perhaps, a separation of the States, we are against it. Whatever the right may be, the success of what he advocates is impossible; and if the South insist upon it, she shows only a determination to set up for herself, and make an end of this Union.

The Editor of the Journal affords to believe that General Cass was not understood, and that Mr. Buchanan was not understood. On the contrary, we believe they were both understood. It was not their fault if they were misunderstood. Their language was as unequivocal as language could be. It is getting to be a fashion these days to misunderstand plain language when it doesn't suit the purpose. The Editor is entirely mistaken in supposing that we put any other construction upon either the position of Cass or Buchanan, than the plain language does. We never made an issue with any one on this subject. We believe the opinion of Chief Justice Taney is right; but we are opposed to Congress interfering with slavery in the territories, in any event. If the responsibility of that body is acknowledged on this point, its action will be adverse to the South; therefore we say, hands off. We have the protection of the courts, and that is sufficient for any practical interest. We greatly prefer trusting the people of the territories, under the control of the judiciary, than Congress. A majority of the North will agree to that; and we are content with it. If the South will not, she can prepare for a separate confederacy. Indeed, we seriously apprehend that this is the object of the chief advocates of this movement. It is thought the best mode to make an issue, not to party North or South, but to make an issue, and make the refusal a ground of complaint that the North will not do its duty.

CLOTHIERS. Go to Blanchard's, AT THE Sign of the Golden Hand, IF YOU WISH TO GET A FINE CLOTHING, and a good fit, call on SHERMAN P. WHALEY, MANUFACTURER OF AND DEALER IN Men's and Youths' CLOTHING, AT THE OLD-ESTABLISHED United States Clothing Warehouse! NORTHWEST CORNER OF MARK AND THIRD STREETS, LOUISVILLE, KY. CLOTHING OF EVERY DESCRIPTION. Call on me to order in the most approved style, and at the lowest prices.

JACOB STELLER, MERCHANT TAILOR, North side Market st., bet. Broad and Floyd, LOUISVILLE, KY. J. H. MONTGOMERY, MERCHANT TAILOR, 407 JEFFERSON STREET, BETWEEN THIRD AND FIFTH, NORTH SIDE, LOUISVILLE, KY. WOULD INFORM HIS FRIENDS THAT he has moved to the new building, and will be supplied with the best of the market, both in food and drink.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is pursuing the course we expected of him. In this instance, it is his best policy. We commend him for this. Let him persevere to the best of his abilities. He has nothing to lose in the North, and something to gain, perhaps, in the South. He is for having slavery protected in the territories; for Congress is; and that, too, by Congress. He feels almost a contempt for the policy that would decline insisting on what he professes to hold to be the rights of the South, on the ground that it is impracticable to accomplish the object. It is not smart in him, but new to become valiant for the South, and we therefore commend his course; it is the best he can do. Hurray for him! It is not often that he shows any political tact; but this time he is almost right.

We assure him that it is a principle with us, not to insist on what is impracticable between the two sections of this Union. If a measure were vital to the North, we should be compelled to go for it; no matter what the consequences might be; but if it is of slight importance, and can only arouse agitation and angry controversy, and, perhaps, a separation of the States, we are against it. Whatever the right may be, the success of what he advocates is impossible; and if the South insist upon it, she shows only a determination to set up for herself, and make an end of this Union.

The Editor of the Journal affords to believe that General Cass was not understood, and that Mr. Buchanan was not understood. On the contrary, we believe they were both understood. It was not their fault if they were misunderstood. Their language was as unequivocal as language could be. It is getting to be a fashion these days to misunderstand plain language when it doesn't suit the purpose. The Editor is entirely mistaken in supposing that we put any other construction upon either the position of Cass or Buchanan, than the plain language does. We never made an issue with any one on this subject. We believe the opinion of Chief Justice Taney is right; but we are opposed to Congress interfering with slavery in the territories, in any event. If the responsibility of that body is acknowledged on this point, its action will be adverse to the South; therefore we say, hands off. We have the protection of the courts, and that is sufficient for any practical interest. We greatly prefer trusting the people of the territories, under the control of the judiciary, than Congress. A majority of the North will agree to that; and we are content with it. If the South will not, she can prepare for a separate confederacy. Indeed, we seriously apprehend that this is the object of the chief advocates of this movement. It is thought the best mode to make an issue, not to party North or South, but to make an issue, and make the refusal a ground of complaint that the North will not do its duty.

The Editor wishes to know if Congress is not bound to protect slavery in the territories. We hold that it is difficult to make out any such obligation on the part of Congress. The argument is far-fetched. There is no express grant of power to legislate for territories, either as persons or property; and it is more in accordance with the genius of our government to surmount all such legislation to the people concerned. We are for decentralizing always, when it is possible under the federal constitution. When the enterprising ladies pioneers begin to fill up our territories, they are not to be controlled by the powers at Washington. They will do as they please, and they will generally prefer to do better than Congress. If let alone, they are likely to adopt a more practical and more judicious legislation toward each other. This community independence is the safest policy in this country; because our people are accustomed to self-government, and are not likely to brook much control by a power remote from them, and in which they have no vote; and in which they are the mere foot ball of parties in the South.

The President himself found it so difficult to get along with one territory, that he earnestly recommended that it be thrown off, by making it a State; although there were not more than one-third enough population to make a State. He found it impossible to exercise any control, satisfactorily, and resolved to get rid of the difficulty. A better illustration of the impossibility of legislating for a territory at Washington could not well be given. The habits and character of our people will deter a wise statesman from pushing any theory into the equivocal and unpractical power of Congress. An old gentleman would not consent that Jack Jones should have his daughter, "Never-Jack Jones,"—couldn't think of it. He found it difficult to get along with his opposition; and the fair one suggested that Jack Jones was not the name; it was Col. Jones. The old gentleman consented at once.

It is very shocking that thirty thousand people in a territory should be trusted at all on the subject of slavery; but just change the name, and these same people can dispose of the whole subject.

The Editor of the Journal will not find anything in our files inconsistent with our position now. We have always regarded this outcry of squatter sovereignty as only a desire of needy partisans to create an agitation, for an end of no possible value. The slavery question is settled fairly. This remaining point is not worth an issue, much less such an agitation as it must necessarily produce.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is very indebted to Judge Campbell, because he has constructed the law adverse to Walker and his emigrants. The editor thinks the Judge should regard the opinions and wishes of his friends who put him in office, and his own antecedents. This is a new rule of judicial construction. We have been convinced, upon reading the law, that it was exceedingly stringent in its provisions; too much so entirely; but a Judge must take it as he finds it. We object to his construing it according to party notions, or according to his discretion as to what it ought to be.

Our neutrality laws need revision. We do not believe they are either right or expedient; but it is the business of Congress to change them, not the business of a Judge to construe them away.

A bill has passed the House of Representatives of Georgia, prohibiting the marriage of first cousins. It was passed by a vote of fifty-six to fifty-two.

THE Editor of the Louisville Journal is pursuing the course we expected of him. In this instance, it is his best policy. We commend him for this. Let him persevere to the best of his abilities. He has nothing to lose in the North, and something to gain, perhaps, in the South. He is for having slavery protected in the territories; for Congress is; and that, too, by Congress. He feels almost a contempt for the policy that would decline insisting on what he professes to hold to be the rights of the South, on the ground that it is impracticable to accomplish the object. It is not smart in him, but new to become valiant for the South, and we therefore commend his course; it is the best he can do. Hurray for him! It is not often that he shows any political tact; but this time he is almost right.





